arXiv:1408.0538v1 [math-ph] 3 Aug 2014

On the Sum of the Non-Negative Lyapunov Exponents for Some Cocycles Related to the Anderson Model

Ilia Binder, Michael Goldstein, Mircea Voda

Abstract

We provide an explicit lower bound for the the sum of the non-negative Lyapunov exponents for some cocycles related to the Anderson model. In particular, for the Anderson model on a strip of width W the lower bound is proportional to $W^{-\varepsilon}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$. This bound is consistent with the fact that the lowest non-negative Lyapunov exponent is conjectured to have a lower bound proportional to W^{-1}.

Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Lower Bound for the Variance 6

3 Large Deviations Estimate 10

4 Transfer Matrices and Dirichlet Determinants 16

5 Proof of the Main Result 23

1 Introduction

We consider the cocycles associated with a family of random operators on the strip $\mathbb{Z}_W := \mathbb{Z} \times \{1,\dots,W\}$ defined by

$$(H\Psi)_n = -\Psi_{n-1} - \Psi_{n+1} + S_n \Psi_n, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Psi \in l^2(\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{C}^W) \equiv l^2(\mathbb{Z}_W)$, and

$$S_n := \mathrm{diag}(V_{(n,1)},\ldots,V_{(n,W)}) - U_n.$$

The potentials V_i are i.i.d. random variables and the random matrices U_n are symmetric and independent of V_i. Let d be a positive integer such that for any n we have $U_n(x,y) = 0$ for $|x-y| > d$. Our methods work even when $d = W$, but the results are close to optimal only when d is fixed as $W \to \infty$. For this reason, the results will emphasize only the latter case and the dependence on d won't be stated explicitly, but it will be clear in the proofs. In particular, if

$$U_n(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & , \text{ if } |x-y| = 1 \\ 0 & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases},$$

then we obtain the usual tight-binding Anderson model on the strip $\mathbb{Z}_W$. In this paper we assume that V_i have bounded density function ρ and we let

$$D_0 := \sup_x \rho(x) < +\infty. \tag{1.2}$$

Furthermore we assume a weak integrability condition:

$$\mathbb{P}(|V_i| \geq T) \leq D_1/T,\ \mathbb{P}(\|U_n\| \geq T) \leq D_1/T,\ T \geq 1. \tag{1.3}$$

The $2W \times 2W$ matrix

$$T_N^E = \prod_{k=N}^{1} \begin{bmatrix} S_k - E & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

is called the N-step transfer matrix and satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{N+1} \\ \Psi_N \end{bmatrix} = T_N^E \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{1.4}$$

for any solution of the difference equation $H\Psi = E\Psi$. Let $\gamma_1^E \geq \ldots \geq \gamma_W^E \geq 0$ be the non-negative Lyapunov exponents associated with the cocycle determined by T_N^E. See [BL85, III.5,IV.3] for definitions and further information. Note that since T_N^E are symplectic matrices it follows that the Lyapunov spectrum of the cocycle splits into a non-negative and a non-positive part, symmetrically with respect to zero. Furthermore, from this and the simplicity of the Lyapunov spectrum (see [GM87]) it follows that in fact $\gamma_1^E > \ldots > \gamma_W^E > 0$.

The positivity of γ_W^E is crucial for Anderson localization. Indeed, it is known that the quasi-one-dimensional Anderson model has (almost surely) only pure point spectrum and its eigenvectors decay exponentially with decay rate proportional to γ_W^E (see [KLS90]). It is thus natural to ask for an explicit lower bound on γ_W^E. In particular one is interested in the asymptotics of the lower bound when $W \to \infty$. This is motivated by the idea of using the localization on strips to understand what happens in $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

The best known lower bound for γ_W^E, due to Bourgain [Bou13] (in the case of the Anderson model), is $\exp(-CW(\log W)^4)$; however, it is expected that it should be of the order of W^{-1}. In [BGV13] we argued that it is possible to obtain lower bounds of the order of W^{-C} provided that we have have a good enough lower bound on the variance of Green's function. The estimate we obtained for the fluctuations of the Green's function was far from optimal and only yielded a somewhat weaker estimate for γ_W^E than the one from [Bou13] . The idea of estimating the localization length through the fluctuations of the resolvent has been previously implemented by Schenker [Sch09] in the context of random band matrices, but it is not clear how to adjust his developments to the Anderson model.

In this paper we consider a problem for which the approach of [BGV13] yields better results. Namely, we provide a lower bound for the sum of the non-negative Lyapunov exponents through a lower bound on the fluctuations of the Dirichlet determinants. We let H_N be the restriction of H to $[1,N]\times[1,W]$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions, and we denote the characteristic polynomial $\det(H_N - E)$ by f_N^E. Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume that there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that $\mathrm{Var}(\log|f_N^E|) \geq \beta_0 NW$ for any $N \geq 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant*

$$c_0 = c_0(D_0, D_1, \beta_0, |E|, \varepsilon)$$

such that

$$\gamma_1^E + \ldots + \gamma_W^E \geq c_0 W^{-\varepsilon}.$$

Note that the estimate we obtain is consistent with the conjectured estimate $\gamma_W^E \gtrsim W^{-1}$. We believe that the estimate for the fluctuations of $\log|f_N^E|$ should be true for general potentials, but we can only establish it for potentials with "considerable tails". Given a set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_W$ we let H_Λ be the restriction, with Dirichlet boundary conditions, of H to Λ and we let $f_\Lambda^E = \det(H_\Lambda - E)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_W$. Then there exist constants $C_0 = C_0(D_0, D_1, |E|, d)$ and C_1 such that*

$$\mathrm{Var}(\log|f_\Lambda^E|) \gtrsim |\Lambda||I| \inf_I \rho(x),$$

for any interval I of the form $[M_0, C_1 M_0]$ or $[-M_0, -C_1 M_0]$, with $M_0 \geq C_0$.

Note that in this paper the constants implied by symbols like $\gtrsim$ or $\gg$ will always be absolute constants. The above theorem says that if ρ has large enough tails, that is if $\rho > 0$ on a large enough interval I, then

$$\mathrm{Var}(\log|f_\Lambda^E|) \geq c(\rho, I, |E|, d)|\Lambda|$$

and, in particular, the assumption needed for Theorem 1.1 is satisfied. Of course, for the lower bound in Theorem 1.1 to be proportional to $W^{-\varepsilon}$ it is important that d should be independent of W. In the case $d = d(W)$ it should be clear from the proofs that we obtain a lower bound proportional to W^{-C}, with some absolute constant C.

The estimate we obtained on the fluctuations of $\log|f_\Lambda^E|$ is probably optimal in $\mathbb{Z}_W$. This should be clear from the following large deviations estimate for the Dirichlet determinants.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(d, D_0, D_1, |E|, \varepsilon)$ such that for any $K \gg 1$ and any rectangular set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_W$ with $|\Lambda| \geq C_0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\log|f_\Lambda^E| - \mathbb{E}\Big(\log|f_\Lambda^E|\Big)\Big| > |\Lambda|^{1/2+\varepsilon} K\Big) \leq \exp(-K/2).$$

The large deviations estimate implies that $\mathrm{Var}(\log|f_\Lambda^E|) \lesssim |\Lambda|^{1+2\varepsilon}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $|\Lambda| \geq C_0$. It follows that both the fluctuations lower bound and the large deviations estimate are close to being optimal on $\mathbb{Z}_W$. Note that the large deviations estimate is in fact independent of W, so it is really a result on $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

We will now discuss the proof of Theorem 1.1. From the proof of the Thouless formula on the strip (see [CS83]; cf. [KS88] and [CL90, Prop. VI.4.4]) we have that

$$\gamma_1^E + \ldots + \gamma_W^E = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|)}{N}. \tag{1.5}$$

In fact, as a consequence of the large deviations estimate from Theorem 1.3 it follows that we have the stronger pointwise result:

$$\gamma_1^E + \ldots + \gamma_W^E \overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\log|f_N^E|}{N},$$

but (1.5) is enough for our purposes. We are able to estimate the rate of convergence in (1.5) (see Proposition 5.2) and reduce the problem of finding a lower bound for the sum of Lyapunov exponents to finding a lower bound for $\mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|)$. The idea behind estimating $\mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|)$ is very simple: if we have a random variable $X \in [0,M]$ then

$$\mathbb{E}X \geq M^{-1}\mathbb{E}X^2 \geq M^{-1}\operatorname{Var}X.$$

Of course, $\log|f_N^E|$ doesn't satisfy the needed assumptions, but we can argue that the values of $\log|f_N^E|$ outside of $[0,(NW)^{1/2+\varepsilon}]$ do not have a significant contribution towards the expected value. For the values greater than $(NW)^{1/2+\varepsilon}$ this follows from the large deviations estimate. For the negative values we use the following Cartan type estimate.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N,W \geq 1$. There exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(D_0,D_1,|E|)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\log|f_N^E| < -10KW) \leq \exp(-K/4).$$

for any $K \geq C_0(1+\log(NW))$.

The above estimate is a crucial improvement over the straightforward estimate that can be obtained from the Wegner estimate:

$$\mathbb{P}(\log|f_N^E| < -KNW) \leq \exp(-K/4).$$

for any $K \geq C(1+\log(NW))$ (see Lemma 3.3 (a)).

Finally, we discuss the organization of the paper. Sections 2 to 4 deal, in order, with the proofs of Theorems 1.2 to 1.4. These sections are independent of each other, with the exception of a few auxiliary lemmas that get used throughout the paper. The main result, Theorem 1.1, is deduced in Section 5.

2 Lower Bound for the Variance

Theorem 1.2 follows, with small modifications, from the proof of the lower bound for the fluctuations of Green's functions [BGV13, Thm. 1.1]. For the convenience of the reader and in the interest of clarity we give a complete proof in this section.

A key ingredient for the proof is the following estimate for the variance of a logarithmic potential. We use m_I to denote the uniform probability measure on a set $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and Var_I to denote the variance with respect to m_I. We also use $\|\cdot\|_I$ to denote the norm in $L^2(I,m_I)$.

Proposition 2.1. *([BGV13, Proposition 2.2 (iii)]) Let μ be a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ and let*

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \log|x-\zeta| d\mu(\zeta).$$

If $\mu(|\zeta| \geq R) = 0$ for some $R > 0$, then for any $M_1 \geq 2M_0 \geq 4R$ one has

$$\left|\mathrm{Var}_{[M_0,M_1]}(u) - 1\right| \lesssim (RM_1^{-1})^{1/5} + (M_0M_1^{-1})^{1/2}.$$

We will also need the estimate on the integrability of the logarithmic potentials from Lemma 2.3. Its proof uses the following standard lemma. We state it as a separate result because we also need it in the other sections. We use the notation $\|X\|_m$ for $(\mathbb{E}X^m)^{1/m}$.

Lemma 2.2. *If $X \geq 0$ is a random variable such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(X > C_0K) \leq \exp(-c_0K),$$

for every $K \geq K_0$, with $c_0 \leq 1$, $C_0, K_0 \geq 1$, then

$$\|X\|_m \lesssim mC_0K_0/c_0, m \geq 1.$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}X^m = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(X > \lambda) m\lambda^{m-1} d\lambda = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(X > C_0K) C_0^m mK^{m-1} dK$$
$$\leq (C_0K_0)^m + C_0^m \int_{K_0}^\infty \exp(-c_0K) mK^{m-1} dK \leq (C_0K_0)^m + C_0^m \Gamma(m+1)/c_0^m.$$

Applying Stirling's formula for the gamma function we conclude that

$$\|X\|_m \lesssim C_0K_0 + mC_0/c_0.$$

Note that we stated the estimate in a weaker form because it is somewhat easier to apply and the weakening doesn't affect the other estimates in this paper. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let μ be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq 1$ and*

$$\mu(|\zeta| > R) \leq C_0/R,\ R \geq C_1.$$

Then for any non-degenerate interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \log|x-\zeta| d\mu(\zeta) \right\|_I \lesssim \max(1, \log M, -\log|I|, \log C_0, \log C_1),$$

where $M = \sup_I |x|$.

Proof. We have

$$\mu \times m_I(\log|x-\zeta| < -K) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_I \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-\zeta|<\exp(-K)\}} dm_I(x) d\mu(\zeta)$$
$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{2\exp(-K)}{|I|} d\mu(\zeta) \leq \frac{2\exp(-K)}{|I|},$$

and

$$\mu \times m_I(\log|x-\zeta| > K) \leq \mu(|\zeta| > \exp(K)/2) + m_I(|x| > \exp(K)/2)$$
$$= \mu(|\zeta| > \exp(K)/2) \leq 2C_0\exp(-K),$$

provided $K \gg \max(1, \log M, \log C_1)$. It follows that

$$\mu \times m_I(|\log|x-\zeta|| > K) \leq \exp(-K/2),$$

provided that $K \gg \max(1, \log M, -\log|I|, \log C_0, \log C_1)$. Now the conclusion follows from Lemma 2.2 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. □

For the convenience of the reader we state the basic general estimates on variance that we will be using.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ be a probability space.*

(i) If X, Y are square summable random variables then

$$|\mathrm{Var}(X)-\mathrm{Var}(Y)| \leq \|X-Y\|(\|X\|+\|Y\|), \tag{2.1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the L^2 norm.

(ii) If X is a square summable random variable and $\mathcal{F}_i$, $i=1,\ldots,n$ are pairwise independent σ-subalgebras of $\mathcal{F}$ then

$$\mathrm{Var}(X) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Var}(\mathbb{E}(X|\mathcal{F}_i)). \tag{2.2}$$

(iii) If X is a square summable random variable and μ_0 is a probability measure such that $\mu \geq c\mu_0$, with $c \geq 0$, then

$$\mathrm{Var}(X) \geq c\mathrm{Var}_{\mu_0}(X). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. (of Theorem 1.2) By the Bessel type inequality (2.2) we get

$$\mathrm{Var}(\log|f_\Lambda^E|) \geq \sum_{k\in\Lambda} \mathrm{Var}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big(\log|f_\Lambda^E|\Big|V_k\Big)\Big).$$

We now just have to provide a lower bound for each term on the right-hand side of the above inequality. We will achieve this by applying Proposition 2.1.

First we construct the logarithmic potential to which we will apply Proposition 2.1. We factorize f_Λ^E by using Schur's formula (see for example [Zha05, Theorem 1.1]). In an appropriate basis we can write

$$H_\Lambda - E = \begin{bmatrix} V_k - U_{k_1}(k_2,k_2) - E & \Gamma \\ \Gamma^t & H_{\Lambda\setminus\{k\}} - E \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\Gamma(k,j) = \begin{cases} -1 & , \text{ if } k_2 = j_2 \text{ and } |k_1 - j_1| = 1 \\ -U_{k_1}(k_2,j_2) & , \text{ if } k_1 = j_1 \text{ and } |k_2 - j_2| \leq d \\ 0 & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

(the rows and columns are labeled by the indices of the potentials that they contain). By Schur's formula we have

$$f_\Lambda^E = (V_k - \xi_k)\det(H_{\Lambda\setminus\{k\}} - E),$$

where

$$\xi_k = U_{k_1}(k_2,k_2) + E + \Gamma(H_{\Lambda\setminus\{k\}} - E)^{-1}\Gamma^t. \tag{2.5}$$

Since $\det(H_{\Lambda\setminus\{k\}} - E)$ is independent of V_k it follows that

$$\mathrm{Var}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big(\log|f_\Lambda^E|\Big|V_k\Big)\Big) = \mathrm{Var}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big(\log|V_k - \xi_k|\Big|V_k\Big)\Big).$$

and $\mathrm{Var}(h_k) = \mathrm{Var}(u_k)$, with Let μ_k be defined by $\mu_k(S) = \mathbb{P}(\xi_k \in S)$. Then we have

$$u_k(x) := \mathbb{E}\Big(\log|V_k - \xi_k|\Big|V_k\Big)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \log|x-\zeta|\, d\mu_k(\zeta).$$

Now that we have the logarithmic potential u_k we set things up for applying Proposition 2.1. Let $I = [A_0R_0, A_1R_0]$, with $A_0, A_1, R_0 > 0$ to be chosen later. The proof is the same for the case $R_0 < 0$ (corresponding to the case $I = [-M_0, -C_1M_0]$ from the statement of the theorem). By Lemma 2.4 (iii) we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(u_k) \geq (\inf_I \rho)|I|\mathrm{Var}_I(u_k).$$

Let $\mu_{k,1}$ and $\mu_{k,2}$ be defined by

$$\mu_{k,1}(S) = \mu_k(S \cap [-R_0, R_0]), \qquad \mu_{k,2}(S) = \mu_k(S \setminus [-R_0, R_0]).$$

Let $u_{k,i}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \log|x-\zeta|\, d\mu_{k,i}(\zeta)$, $i = 1,2$. By applying Proposition 2.1 to $u_{k,1}/\mu_k([-R_0, R_0])$ we obtain

$$\mathrm{Var}_I(u_{k,1}) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\mu_k([-R_0, R_0]))^2,$$

provided $1 \ll A_0 \ll A_1$. From [AM93, Theorem II.1] we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|(H_\Lambda - E)^{-1}(i,j)| \geq T) \lesssim D_0/T, \tag{2.6}$$

for any Λ and any $i, j \in \Lambda$. From this estimate and the integrability assumption (1.3) (see also (2.4) and (2.5)) it follows that

$$\mu_k(|\zeta| > R) = \mathbb{P}(|\xi_k| > R) \leq Cd^2(d^2/R)^{1/3},$$

for any $R \gg d^2|E|$ and with $C = C(D_0, D_1)$. As a consequence we get that

$$(\mu_k([-R_0, R_0]))^2 \geq \Big(1 - C(d^8/R_0)^{1/3}\Big)^2 \geq 1/2,$$

provided $R_0 \geq C(D_0, D_1, |E|)d^8$. So, if R_0 is large enough then $\mathrm{Var}_I(u_{k,1}) \geq 1/4$.

The last step is to see that the bound on the fluctuations of $u_{k,1}$ implies a bound for the fluctuations of u_k. By Lemma 2.4 (i) we have

$$|\mathrm{Var}_I(u_k) - \mathrm{Var}_I(u_{k,1})| \leq \|u_{k,2}\|_I (\|u_{k,1}\|_I + \|u_k\|_I).$$

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\|u_{k,2}\|_I \leq \sqrt{\mu_k(|\zeta| > R_0)}\|u_k\|_I \leq C(d^8/R_0)^{1/6}\|u_k\|_I.$$

Now Lemma 2.3 implies that

$$\|u_{k,2}\|_I (\|u_{k,1}\|_I + \|u_k\|_I) \leq C(d^8/R_0)^{1/6}\log^2 R_0 \leq 1/8,$$

provided $R_0 \geq C(D_0, D_1, |E|)d^9$. Hence we have $\mathrm{Var}_I(u_k) \geq 1/8$.

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(\log|f_\Lambda^E|) &\geq \sum_{k\in\Lambda} \mathrm{Var}(h_k) \\ &= \sum_{k\in\Lambda} \mathrm{Var}(u_k) \geq \sum_{k\in\Lambda} |I|(\inf_I \rho)\mathrm{Var}_I(u_k) \geq |\Lambda||I|(\inf_I \rho)/8,\end{aligned}$$

for any $I = [A_0 R_0, A_1 R_0]$ with $R_0 \geq C(D_0, D_1, |E|)d^9$ and $A_1 \gg A_0 \gg 1$. □

3 Large Deviations Estimate

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.3. The main idea is that $\log|f_\Lambda^E|$ can be approximated by a sum of independent random variables (alas, the error term is quite large). Namely, if $\{\Lambda_i\}$ is a partition of Λ then we will see that

$$\log|f_\Lambda^E| \approx \sum_i \log|f_{\Lambda_i}^E|. \tag{3.1}$$

The precise formulation is Lemma 3.3 (b). Once this is established we will obtain the large deviations estimates by applying the following exponential bound due to Bernstein (see [Pet95, Thm. 2.8]).

Theorem 3.1 (Bernstein)**.** *Let X_i be independent random variables such that $\mathbb{E}X_i = 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Suppose that there exist positive constants σ and T such that*

$$|\mathbb{E}X_i^m| \leq \frac{1}{2} m! \sigma^2 T^{m-2}, \ i = 1, \ldots, n$$

for all integers $m \geq 2$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i\right| \geq x\right) \leq \exp(-x/4T), \text{ if } x \geq n\sigma^2/T.$$

So, our first goal is to obtain (3.1). This will be a consequence of the following general result. We use the notation $\log^{\pm} := \max(\pm\log, 0)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let H_1 and H_2 be two self-adjoint operators on the same finite dimensional vector space. Then for any $E \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\log|\det(H_1 - E)| - \log|\det(H_2 - E)| \\ &\qquad \leq 4\mathrm{rank}(H_1 - H_2)\max(\log^+(|E| + \|H_1\|), \log^- \mathrm{dist}(E, \mathrm{spec}\, H_2)).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let N be the dimension of the vector space and let E_j^i, $j = 1, \ldots, N$ be the eigenvalues of H_i, arranged in increasing order. We will use r to denote the rank of $H_1 - H_2$. It is known that we have the following interlacing inequalities due to Weyl (see [HJ85, Thm. 4.3.6]):

$$\begin{aligned}E_j^1 &\leq E_{j+r}^2, \ j = 1, \ldots, N - r, \\ E_{j-r}^2 &\leq E_j^1, \ j = r + 1, \ldots, N.\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$G_- = \{j : \ E_j^1 - E < 0, j \geq r + 1\}, \quad G_+ = \{j : \ E_j^1 - E \geq 0, j \leq N - r\}.$$

Then from the interlacing inequalities it follows that

$$|E_j^1 - E| \leq |E_{j-r}^2 - E|, j \in G_-, \qquad |E_j^1 - E| \leq |E_{j+r}^2 - E|, j \in G_+.$$

Let

$$B_1 = [1, N] \setminus (G_- \cup G_+), \quad B_2 = [1, N] \setminus ((-r + G_-) \cup (r + G_+)).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum \log|E_j^1 - E| - \sum \log|E_j^2 - E| \\ &= \sum_{j \in G_-} (\log|E_j^1 - E| - \log|E_{j-r}^2 - E|) + \sum_{j \in G_+} (\log|E_j^1 - E| - \log|E_{j+r}^2 - E|) \\ &\qquad + \sum_{j \in B_1} \log|E_j^1 - E| - \sum_{j \in B_2} \log|E_j^2 - E| \\ &\qquad \leq \sum_{j \in B_1} \log|E_j^1 - E| - \sum_{j \in B_2} \log|E_j^2 - E| \\ &\qquad\qquad \leq 4r \max(\log^+(|E| + \|H_1\|), \log^- \mathrm{dist}(E, \mathrm{spec}\, H_2)).\end{aligned}$$

We used the fact that $|B_1|, |B_2| \leq 2r$. This concludes the proof. ∎

Of course, from the above lemma it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\log|\det(H_1-E)|-\log|\det(H_2-E)||\\&\qquad\le 4\mathrm{rank}(H_1-H_2)\max_i\max(\log^+(|E|+\|H_i\|),\log^-\mathrm{dist}(E,\mathrm{spec}\,H_i)),\end{aligned}$$

which is what interests us at the moment, but the one sided estimate stated in the lemma will be needed later in Lemma 4.4.

We are ready to make (3.1) precise. We also prove a related estimate needed for obtaining bounds on the moments of $\log|f_\Lambda^E|$. Given two sets $\Lambda_0\subset\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}_W$ we use $\partial_\Lambda\Lambda_0$ to denote the set of $i\in\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_0$ such that there exists $j\in\Lambda_0$ that has a bond to i.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}_W$ and $E\in\mathbb{R}$. There exists $C_0=C_0(D_0,D_1,|E|)$ such that the following statements are true for all $K\ge C_0(1+\log|\Lambda|)$.*

(a) We have

$$\mathbb{P}(|\log|f_\Lambda^E||>|\Lambda|K)\le\exp(-K/4).$$

(b) If $\{\Lambda_i\}$ is a partition of Λ then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\log|f_\Lambda^E|-\sum_i\log|f_{\Lambda_i}^E|\right|>4|\cup_i\partial_\Lambda\Lambda_i|K\right)\le\exp(-K/4).$$

Proof. (a) We have

$$|\log|f_\Lambda^E||\le|\Lambda|\max\Big(\log^+(|E|+\|H_\Lambda\|),\log^-\mathrm{dist}(E,\mathrm{spec}\,H_\Lambda)\Big).$$

It follows that if $\log|f_\Lambda^E|>K|\Lambda|$, then either $\log(|E|+\|H_\Lambda\|)>K$ or

$$\log\mathrm{dist}(E,\mathrm{spec}\,H_\Lambda)<-K.$$

Since $\|H_\Lambda\|\le 2+\max_i|V_i|+\max_n\|U_n\|$, it follows from (1.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}(\log(|E|+\|H_\Lambda\|)>K)\\&\qquad\le\mathbb{P}(\log(|E|+2+\max_i|V_i|+\max_n\|U_n\|)>K)\\&\qquad\le|\Lambda|[\mathbb{P}(|V_i|>\exp(K)/3)+\mathbb{P}(\|U_n\|\ge\exp(K)/3)]\\&\qquad\lesssim D_1|\Lambda|\exp(-K)\le\exp(-K/2),\end{aligned}$$

provided $K \geq C(1+\log|\Lambda|)$, with $C = C(D_1,|E|)$. Wegner's estimate (see [CGK09, (2.4)]) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\log(\operatorname{dist}(E,\operatorname{spec} H_\Lambda)) < -K) \lesssim D_0|\Lambda|\exp(-K) \leq \exp(-K/2),$$

provided $K \geq C(1+\log|\Lambda|)$, with $C = C(D_0)$. Now the desired estimate follows immediately.
(b) Let $H'_\Lambda = \oplus_i H_{\Lambda_i}$. Since we have that $\operatorname{rank}(H_\Lambda - H'_\Lambda) \leq |\cup_i \partial_\Lambda \Lambda_i|$ (the vectors that vanish on $\cup_i \partial_\Lambda \Lambda_i$ are in the kernel of $H_\Lambda - H'_\Lambda$) it follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \sum_i \log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|\right| \\ &\qquad \leq 4|\cup_i \partial_\Lambda \Lambda_i| \max\Big(\log^+(|E|+\|H_\Lambda\|), \log^- \operatorname{dist}(E, \cup_i \operatorname{spec}\Lambda_i \cup \operatorname{spec}\Lambda)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

We used the fact that we obviously have

$$\|H'_\Lambda\| \leq \max_i \|H_{\Lambda_i}\| \leq \|H_\Lambda\|.$$

The desired estimate follows analogously to the proof of (a). □

We are now ready to apply Bernstein's exponential bound. The estimate depends on the moment estimates for $\log|f^E_\Lambda|$. It turns out that the large deviations estimate that we obtain implies an improvement of the moment estimates which in turn lead to a better large deviations estimate. So we will prove Theorem 1.3 through a recursion. We use the next proposition to facilitate the recursion.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that there exist positive constants C_0 and $\delta_0 \leq 1/2$ such that*

$$\left\|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_\Lambda|)\right\|_m \leq mC_0|\Lambda|^{1/2+\delta_0}(1+\log|\Lambda|), \tag{3.2}$$

for any rectangular $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_W$ and any integer $m \geq 2$. Then there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(d, D_0, D_1, |E|)$ such that for $K \gg 1$ and any rectangular Λ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_\Lambda|)| > C_0C_1|\Lambda|^{1/2+c_0\delta_0}(1+\log|\Lambda|)K\Big) \leq \exp(-K/2),$$

with $c_0 = 1/(1+2\delta_0)$.

Proof. Let l denote the integer part of $|\Lambda|^{1/2-c_0\delta_0}$ and let $\{\Lambda_i\}$ be the partition of Λ by the cells of the lattice $(l\mathbb{Z})\times(l\mathbb{Z})$ centered at the lower left corner of Λ. Note that we have

$$|\Lambda_i| \le l^2 \le |\Lambda|^{1-2c_0\delta_0}, \qquad |\cup_i \partial_\Lambda \Lambda_i| \lesssim d|\Lambda|/l \lesssim d|\Lambda|^{1/2+c_0\delta_0}.$$

We will obtain the conclusion from the inequality

$$\Big|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_\Lambda|)\Big| \le \Big|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \sum_i \log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|\Big| + \mathbb{E}\left(\Big|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \sum_i \log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|\Big|\right) + \Big|\sum_i \Big(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|)\Big)\Big|, \quad (3.3)$$

by estimating, with high probability, each of the terms on the right hand side.

Applying Lemma 3.3 (b) we obtain

$$\Big|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \sum_i \log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|\Big| \le 4C|\cup_i \partial_\Lambda \Lambda_i|(1+\log|\Lambda|)K \lesssim Cd|\Lambda|^{1/2+c_0\delta_0}(1+\log|\Lambda|)K, \quad (3.4)$$

except for a set of measure smaller than

$$\exp(-C(1+\log|\Lambda|)K/4) \le \exp(-K),$$

provided $C = C(D_0, D_1, |E|) \ge 4$.

From Lemma 3.3 (b) and Lemma 2.2 we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\Big|\log|f^E_\Lambda| - \sum_i \log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|\Big|\right) \le C|\cup_i \partial_\Lambda \Lambda_i|(1+\log|\Lambda|) \lesssim Cd|\Lambda|^{1/2+c_0\delta_0}(1+\log|\Lambda|), \quad (3.5)$$

with $C = C(D_0, D_1, |E|)$.

To estimate the last term on the right-hand side of (3.3) we will use Theorem 3.1. For this we need to estimate the number of sets in the partition $\{\Lambda_i\}$. Depending on the proportions of Λ the bound can range from $|\Lambda|/l^2$ (the "typical" case) to $|\Lambda|/l$ (when Λ is a very narrow strip). Each case can be dealt with similarly, but the choices of constants in Theorem 3.1 need to be adjusted. To account for these adjustments we separate the partition into sets of the same size. Let I_k, $1 \le k \le 4$, denote the sets of indices corresponding to the maximal subfamilies of $\{\Lambda_i\}$ of sets with the same dimensions.



Let A_k be the size of the sets Λ_i with indices in I_k. We will apply Theorem 3.1 with $X_i = A_k^{-(1/2+\delta_0)}(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|))$, $i \in I_k$. From the hypothesis (3.2) it follows that

$$|\mathbb{E}X_i^m| \leq \frac{1}{A_k^{m(1/2+\delta_0)}}\Big(mC_0A_k^{1/2+\delta_0}(1+\log A_k)\Big)^m \leq \frac{1}{2}m!\sigma_k^2T_k^{m-2},$$

with $T_k \geq \sigma_k := CC_0(1+\log A_k)$, $C \gg 1$. Applying Theorem 3.1 we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i\in I_k}\Big(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|)\Big)\right| \geq x_kA_k^{1/2+\delta_0}\right) \leq \exp(-x_k/4T_k), \tag{3.6}$$

provided $x_k \geq |I_k|\sigma_k^2/T_k$. In particular, a straightforward computation shows that (3.6) holds with $x_k = 4K\sigma_k\sqrt{|\Lambda|/A_k}$ and $T_k = \sigma_k\sqrt{|\Lambda|/A_k}$, provided $K \geq 1/4$. Since

$$x_kA_k^{1/2+\delta_0} = 4K\sigma_k|\Lambda|^{1/2}A_k^{\delta_0} \leq 4K\sigma_k|\Lambda|^{1/2}|\Lambda|^{\delta_0(1-2c_0\delta_0)} = 4K\sigma_k|\Lambda|^{1/2+c_0\delta_0},$$

it follows that for any k we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i\in I_k}\Big(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_{\Lambda_i}|)\Big)\right| \geq CC_0|\Lambda|^{1/2+c_0\delta_0}(1+\log|\Lambda|)K\right) \leq \exp(-K). \tag{3.7}$$

Plugging the estimates (3.4), (3.5), and (3.7) into (3.3) yields

$$|\log|f_\Lambda| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f_\Lambda|)| \leq CC_0|\Lambda|^{1/2+c_0\delta_0}(1+\log|\Lambda|)K,$$

except for a set of measure less than $5\exp(-K) \leq \exp(-K/2)$, provided $K \gg 1$. This concludes the proof. □

Proof. (of Theorem 1.3) From Lemma 3.3 (a) and Lemma 2.2 it follows that for any $m \geq 1$ and any $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_W$ we have

$$\Big\| \log|f_\Lambda^E| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f_\Lambda^E|) \Big\|_m \leq mC|\Lambda|^{1/2+\delta_0}(1+\log|\Lambda|),$$

with $C = C(D_0, D_1, |E|)$ and $\delta_0 = 1/2$. By applying Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 2.2 n times we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|\log|f_\Lambda^E| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f_\Lambda^E|)| > C(C')^n|\Lambda|^{1/2+\delta_n}(1+\log|\Lambda|)K \Big) \leq \exp(-K/2),$$

with $K \gg 1$, $C' = C'(d, D_0, D_1, |E|)$, and δ_n defined recursively by

$$\delta_n = \delta_{n-1}/(1+2\delta_{n-1}).$$

The conclusion follows immediately by noticing that $\delta_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ (in fact we have $\delta_n = 1/(2n+2)$). □

4 Transfer Matrices and Dirichlet Determinants

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4. The idea for the proof of Theorem 1.4 is to exploit the fact that $\det T_N^E = 1$. In the case $W = 1$ it is well-known that

$$T_N^E = \begin{bmatrix} f_{[1,N]}^E & -f_{[2,N]}^E \\ f_{[1,N-1]}^E & -f_{[2,N-1]}^E \end{bmatrix}.$$

So it follows that

$$1 \leq \left\| T_N^E \right\| \leq |f_{[1,N]}^E| + |f_{[1,N-1]}^E| + |f_{[2,N-1]}^E| + |f_{[2,N-1]}^E|.$$

This implies that at least one of the determinants cannot be smaller than $1/4$. The conclusion of Theorem 1.4 would follow by noticing that all the determinants are roughly the same due to Lemma 3.2. To apply this strategy for the general case $W \geq 1$ we will work with the W-th exterior power of T_N^E. We refer to [BL85, III.5] for a brief review of the exterior algebra. The entries of the matrix $\bigwedge^W T_N^E$ are the $W \times W$ minors of T_N^E. Let us be more explicit. We use e_i, $i = 1, \ldots, 2W$ to denote the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{2W}$. For any $\alpha \subset \{1, \ldots, 2W\}$ let $e_\alpha = \bigwedge_{i \in \alpha} e_i$. The vectors e_α, with $|\alpha| = W$ form the

standard basis of $\bigwedge^W \mathbb{R}^{2W}$. For any decomposable vector $u = u_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge u_W$ we will use $[u]$ to denote the matrix with columns $u_1,\ldots,u_W$. The space $\bigwedge^W \mathbb{R}^{2W}$ is equipped with an inner product defined through the formula

$$\langle u,v\rangle = \det([u]^t[v]),$$

where u and v are decomposable vectors and $[u]^t$ denotes the transpose of $[u]$. The entries of $\bigwedge^W T_N^E$ (with respect to the standard basis) are of the form

$$\langle e_\beta, \bigwedge^W T_N^E e_\alpha\rangle = \det([e_\beta]^t T_N^E [e_\alpha]).$$

For our purposes we need to figure out what is the connection between the entries of $\bigwedge^W T_N^E$ and Dirichlet determinants. It is not hard to see that $\det([e_\beta]^t T_N^E [e_\alpha]) = f_N^E$, when $\alpha = \beta = \{1,\ldots,W\}$. For example, this is a consequence of the following lemma. This is also known from [CS83, Prop. 3.1], but the next result is crucial for us because it holds even for non-symmetric matrices.

Lemma 4.1. *If M_k, $k = 1,\ldots,N$ are $W \times W$ matrices then the determinant of*

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_1 & -I & & & & & \\ -I & M_2 & -I & & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & & -I & M_{N-1} & -I \\ & & & & & -I & M_N \end{bmatrix}$$

is equal to the determinant of

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \left(\prod_{k=N}^{1} \begin{bmatrix} M_k & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

or, in other words, the determinant of the top-left $W \times W$ block of the transfer matrix.

Proof. By continuity it is enough to prove the result for the case when the matrices M_k are invertible. The proof is by induction on N. The case $N = 1$ is trivially true. We assume the statement to be true for N and we prove it

for $N+1$. Let A_N denote the $(NW)\times(NW)$ matrix from the statement of the lemma. We can write

$$A_{N+1} = \begin{bmatrix} A_N & \Gamma \\ \Gamma^t & M_{N+1} \end{bmatrix}$$

with Γ a $(N-1)W \times W$ matrix with the bottom $W\times W$ block equal to $-I$ and all the other entries equal to zero. By Schur's formula we have

$$\det A_{N+1} = \det M_{N+1} \det(A_N - \Gamma M_{N+1}^{-1}\Gamma^t). \tag{4.1}$$

A direct computation shows that

$$A_N - \Gamma M_{N+1}^{-1}\Gamma^t = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & -I & & & & & \\ -I & M_2 & -I & & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & & -I & M_{N-1} & -I \\ & & & & & -I & M_N - M_{N+1}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\det(A_N - \Gamma M_{N+1}^{-1}\Gamma^t) \\ &\qquad = \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_N - M_{N+1}^{-1} & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \left(\prod_{k=N-1}^{1} \begin{bmatrix} M_k & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows from the above and (4.1) by noticing that

$$M_{N+1} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_N - M_{N+1}^{-1} & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_{N+1} & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_N & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

□

Not all of the entries of $\bigwedge^W T_N^E$ are determinants of self-adjoint matrices (see [CS83, Prop. 3.1] and the ensuing comments). Furthermore, it is not clear wether all the entries are related to eigenvalue problems. To better understand this let us discuss the eigenvalue problems associated with $\det([v]^t T_N^E [u])$, where u,v are non-trivial decomposable vectors in $\bigwedge^W \mathbb{R}^{2W}$ (of course, our immediate interest is in the case when u,v are vectors from

the standard basis). We follow [CL90, III.5.1]. Let u,v be two non-trivial decomposable vectors in $\bigwedge^W \mathbb{R}^{2W}$. We have that $\det([v]^t T_N^E[u]) = 0$ if and only if there exists a non-trivial vector $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^W$ such that $[v]^t T_N^E[u]\Phi = 0$. Starting with Φ we can use the transfer matrix to build a solution $\Psi \in l^2([0,N+1],\mathbb{C}^W)$ of

$$(H\Psi)_i = E\Psi_i, i \in [1,N].$$

The solution Ψ is defined by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{k+1} \\ \Psi_k \end{bmatrix} = T_k^E[u]\Phi, \quad k = 0,\ldots,N,$$

where we let T_0^E be the identity matrix. Clearly the solution satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{Ran}([u]), \qquad \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{N+1} \\ \Psi_N \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{Ker}([v]^t). \tag{4.2}$$

Given a decomposable vector w we will use A_w and B_w to denote the top and bottom $W \times W$ blocks of $[w]$, so we have

$$[w] = \begin{bmatrix} A_w \\ B_w \end{bmatrix}.$$

Assuming that A_u and A_v are invertible it follows that the boundary conditions (4.2) are equivalent to

$$\Psi_0 = B_u A_u^{-1}\Psi_1, \qquad \Psi_{N+1} = -(B_v A_v^{-1})^t \Psi_N.$$

Based on this we define the following operator on $l^2([1,N],\mathbb{C}^W)$:

$$(H_N(u,v)\Psi)_i = \begin{cases} -\Psi_2 + (S_1 - B_u A_u^{-1})\Psi_1 & ,i = 1 \\ (H\Psi)_i & ,i \in [2,N-1] \\ -\Psi_{N-1} + (S_N + (B_v A_v^{-1})^t)\Psi_N & ,i = N \end{cases}.$$

Let $f_N^E(u,v) = \det(H_N(u,v) - E)$. From the construction of $H_N(u,v)$ it follows that $\det([v]^t T_N^E[u]) = 0$ if and only if E is an eigenvalue for $H_N(u,v)$. Hence, it is not surprising that $\det([v]^t T_N^E[u])$ and $f_N^E(u,v)$ are the same up to a multiplicative constant. More precisely we have the following result.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $E \in \mathbb{C}$ and let u and v be decomposable vectors such that A_u and A_v are invertible. Then we have*

$$\det(A_u A_v) f_N^E(u,v) = \det([v]^t T_N^E[u]).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&[v]^t T_N^E[u] \\
&\quad = A_v^t \begin{bmatrix} I & (B_v A_v^{-1})^t \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_N - E & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \left(\prod_{k=N-1}^{2} \begin{bmatrix} S_k - E & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&\qquad \cdot \begin{bmatrix} S_1 - E & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ B_u A_u^{-1} \end{bmatrix} A_u \\
&\quad = A_v^t \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_N + (B_v A_v^{-1})^t - E & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \left(\prod_{k=N-1}^{2} \begin{bmatrix} S_k - E & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&\qquad \cdot \begin{bmatrix} S_1 - B_u A_u^{-1} - E & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} A_u.
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion now follows from Lemma 4.1. □

When u,v are part of the standard basis we don't have, in general, that A_u, A_v are invertible. So it is not clear what eigenvalue problems can be associated with $\det([e_\beta]^t T_N^E[e_\alpha])$. To make use of the above discussion we will work with a different basis of $\bigwedge^W \mathbb{R}^{2W}$. Clearly, we need to have control on the norms of A_u^{-1} and B_u for all u in the new basis. We deal with these issues in the following.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a basis $\{u_\alpha\}$ of $\bigwedge^W \mathbb{R}^{2W}$ with $A_{u_\alpha} = I$ and $\|B_{u_\alpha}\| \leq 1$ for all α, such that the vectors from the standard basis can be written as linear combinations of $\{u_\alpha\}$ with coefficients having absolute value lesser or equal to 1.*

Proof. We build the basis explicitly. For any $\alpha \subset [1,2W]$, with $|\alpha| = W$, we let $u_\alpha = \bigwedge_{i \in [1,W]} u_{\alpha,i}$, where

$$u_{\alpha,i} = \begin{cases} e_i & ,i \in \alpha \\ e_i + e_{\phi_\alpha(i)} & ,i \notin \alpha \end{cases}$$

and ϕ_α is a bijection from $[1,W]\setminus\alpha$ to $\alpha\cap[W+1,2W]$. We clearly have that $A_{u_\alpha}=I$ and $\|B_{u_\alpha}\|\leq 1$ (B_{u_α} is the matrix with the i-th column equal to zero if $i\in\alpha$ and equal to $d_{\phi_\alpha(i)-W}$ if $i\notin\alpha$, where $\{d_i\}$ is the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^W$).

Now we just have to check that $\{u_\alpha\}$ generates the standard basis, with the stated bounds on the coefficients. Fix $\alpha\subset[1,2W]$, with $|\alpha|=W$. Let the elements of α be $\alpha_1\leq\ldots\leq\alpha_W$ and let k be such that $\alpha\cap[1,W]=\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_k\}$. The conclusion follows by writing

$$\begin{aligned} e_\alpha &= e_{\alpha_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge e_{\alpha_k} \\ &\wedge\Big[\Big(e_{\alpha_{k+1}}+e_{\phi_\alpha^{-1}(\alpha_{k+1})}\Big)-e_{\phi_\alpha^{-1}(\alpha_{k+1})}\Big]\wedge\ldots\wedge\Big[\Big(e_{\alpha_W}+e_{\phi_\alpha^{-1}(\alpha_W)}\Big)-e_{\phi_\alpha^{-1}(\alpha_W)}\Big] \end{aligned}$$

and expanding the square brackets. □

From the previous lemma it follows that for any α_0,β_0 we have

$$|\langle e_{\beta_0},\textstyle\bigwedge^W T_N^E e_{\alpha_0}\rangle|\leq\sum|\langle u_\alpha,\bigwedge^W T_N^E u_\beta\rangle|$$

and consequently

$$\Big\|\textstyle\bigwedge^W T_N^E\Big\|\leq\exp(CW)\sum|\det([u_\beta]^t T_N^E[u_\alpha])|, \tag{4.3}$$

with C an absolute constant. We would now like to argue that the determinants on the right-hand side are roughly the same as f_N^E. This only works for the determinants corresponding to symmetric matrices. However, we will only need the following weaker estimate that also holds for the determinants of non-symmetric matrices.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $E\in\mathbb{R}$ and let $\{u_\alpha\}$ be the basis from Lemma 4.3. Then there exists a constant $C_0=C_0(D_0,D_1,|E|)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\alpha,\beta,\log|f_N^E(u_\alpha,u_\beta)|-\log|f_N^E|>8KW\Big)\leq\exp(-K/4),$$

for any $K\geq C_0(1+\log(NW))$.

Proof. Let

$$\tilde{H}_1=(H_N(u_\alpha,u_\beta)-E)^t(H_N(u_\alpha,u_\beta)-E)$$

and

$$\tilde{H}_2=(H_N-E)^t(H_N-E).$$

By a direct computation of $\tilde{H}_1 - \tilde{H}_2$ one sees that $\operatorname{rank}(\tilde{H}_1 - \tilde{H}_2) \leq 4W$. Applying Lemma 3.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2\log|f_N^E(u_\alpha,u_\beta)| - 2\log|f_N^E| &= \log|\det\tilde{H}_1| - \log|\det\tilde{H}_2| \\ &\leq 16W\max(\log^+\left\|\tilde{H}_1\right\|, \log^-\operatorname{dist}(0,\operatorname{spec}\tilde{H}_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Next we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\tilde{H}_1\right\| &\leq \|H_N(u_\alpha,u_\beta) - E\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(2 + \max_i|V_i| + \max_n\|U_n\| + |E| + \left\|B_{u_\alpha}A_{u_\alpha}^{-1}\right\| + \left\|B_{u_\beta}A_{u_\beta}^{-1}\right\|\right)^2 \\ &\leq (\max_i|V_i| + \max_n\|U_n\| + |E| + 4)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\operatorname{dist}(0,\operatorname{spec}\tilde{H}_2) = (\operatorname{dist}(E,\operatorname{spec}H_N))^2.$$

From the above relations we can now conclude (as in the proof of Lemma 3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\exists\alpha,\beta, \log|f_N^E(u_\alpha,u_\beta)| - \log|f_N^E| > 8KW\right) \\ &\qquad \leq \mathbb{P}(\log\left\|\tilde{H}_1\right\| > K) + \mathbb{P}(\log(\operatorname{dist}(0,\operatorname{spec}\tilde{H}_2)) < -K) \\ &\qquad \leq \mathbb{P}(\max_i|V_i| > \exp(-K/2)/3 + \mathbb{P}(\max_n\|U_n\| > \exp(-K/2)/3) \\ &\qquad\qquad + \mathbb{P}(\operatorname{dist}(E,\operatorname{spec}H_N) < \exp(-K/2)) \leq \exp(-K/4), \end{aligned}$$

provided $K \geq C(1+\log(NW))$, with $C = C(D_0,D_1,|E|)$.

Note that it is not possible to repeat the argument by switching $\tilde{H}_1$ with $\tilde{H}_2$ because we don't have a Wegner estimate for the non-symmetric matrix $\tilde{H}_2$. □

We have all we need to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.4) We have that $\left\|\bigwedge^W T_N^E\right\|^{\binom{2W}{W}} \geq |\det\bigwedge^W T_N^E| = 1$. The last identity follows from the Sylvester-Franke Theorem (see, for example, [Tor52]). Using (4.3) it follows that $\max_{\alpha,\beta}|f_N^E(u_\alpha,u_\beta)| \geq \exp(-CW)$, with some absolute constant C. From Lemma 4.4 we can conclude that

$$\log|f_N^E| \geq \max_{\alpha,\beta}\log|f_N^E(u_\alpha,u_\beta)| - 8KW \geq -10KW,$$

except for a set of measure less than $\exp(-K/4)$, for any $K \geq C(1+\log(NW))$ with $C = C(D_0,D_1,|E|)$ large enough. □

5 Proof of the Main Result

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. As was mentioned in the introduction, we will first estimate the rate of convergence in (1.5) and provide a lower bound for $\mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|)$.

We will use the following lemma to estimate the rate of convergence in (1.5).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $E\in\mathbb{R}$. There exists a constant $C_0=C_0(D_0,D_1,|E|)$ such that*

$$\left|\frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f_{N_1}^E|)}{N_1}-\frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f_{N_2}^E|)}{N_2}\right|\le C_0\frac{W\log(N_1W)}{N_2},$$

for any $N_1\ge N_2^2>1$.

Proof. Let $n=[N_1/N_2]$ and

$$\Lambda_i=([1,N_1]\cap[iN_2+1,(i+1)N_2])\times[1,W],i=0,\dots,n.$$

Applying Lemma 3.3 (b) and Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\mathbb{E}(\log|f_{N_1}^E|)-\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}\left(\log|f_{\Lambda_i}^E|\right)\right|&=\left|\mathbb{E}(\log|f_{N_1}^E|)-n\mathbb{E}\left(\log|f_{N_2}^E|\right)-\mathbb{E}\left(\log|f_{\Lambda_n}^E|\right)\right|\\&\le CnW\log(N_1W).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\left|\frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f_{N_1}^E|)}{N_1}-\frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f_{N_2}^E|)}{N_2}\right|\le C\frac{W\log(N_1W)}{N_2}+\frac{\mathbb{E}(|\log|f_{N_2}^E||)}{N_1}+\frac{\mathbb{E}(|\log|f_{\Lambda_n}^E||)}{N_1}.$$

By Lemma 3.3 (a), Lemma 2.2, and the assumption that $N_1\ge N_2^2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathbb{E}(|\log|f_{N_2}^E||)}{N_1}+\frac{\mathbb{E}(|\log|f_{\Lambda_n}^E||)}{N_1}&\le\frac{CN_2W\log(N_2W)}{N_1}+\frac{CN_2W\log(N_2W)}{N_1}\\&\lesssim C\frac{W\log(N_1W)}{N_2}.\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows immediately. □

Proposition 5.2. *Let $E\in\mathbb{R}$. There exists a constant $C_0=C_0(D_0,D_1,|E|)$ such that for any $N>1$ we have*

$$\left|\gamma_1^E+\ldots+\gamma_W^E-\frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|)}{N}\right|\le C_0\frac{W\log(NW)}{N}.$$

Proof. Let $N_k = N^{2^k}$. By applying Lemma 5.1 k times we get

$$\left| \frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_{N_k}|)}{N_k} - \frac{\mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_N|)}{N} \right| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{CW\log(N_{j+1}W)}{N_j}. \tag{5.1}$$

Since

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{CW\log(N_{j+1}W)}{N_j} = CW\left(\frac{\log N}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{j+1}}{N^{2^j-1}} + \frac{\log W}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N^{2^j-1}} \right) \lesssim \frac{CW\log(NW)}{N},$$

the conclusion follows from (1.5) by letting $k \to \infty$ in (5.1). □

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that* $\mathrm{Var}(\log|f^E_N|) \geq \beta_0 NW$. *Let* $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. *Then there exists a constant* $C_0 = C_0(D_0, D_1, |E|, \beta_0, \varepsilon)$ *such that we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_N|) \geq \frac{\beta_0}{8}(NW)^{1/2-\varepsilon},$$

for any $N \geq C_0 W^{1+5\varepsilon}$.

Proof. We can assume that $\mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_N|) \leq (NW)^{1/2}$ because otherwise there is nothing to prove. Let $\Omega_- = \{\log|f^E_N| < 0\}$, $\Omega = \{\log|f^E_N| \in [0, 2(NW)^{1/2+\varepsilon}]\}$, and $\Omega_+ = \{\log|f^E_N| > 2(NW)^{1/2+\varepsilon}\}$. Also let

$$X_- = \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_-}\log|f^E_N|, \quad X = \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}\log|f^E_N|, \quad X_+ = \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_+}\log|f^E_N|.$$

We have

$$\mathbb{E}(\log|f^E_N|) \geq \mathbb{E}(X) + \mathbb{E}(X_-) \geq \frac{1}{2}(NW)^{-1/2-\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}(X^2) + \mathbb{E}(X_-).$$

The conclusion will follow after we provide lower bounds for $\mathbb{E}(X^2)$ and $\mathbb{E}(X_-)$.

We have

$$\mathbb{E}(X^2) \geq \mathrm{Var}(\log|f^E_N|) - \mathbb{E}(X_-^2) - \mathbb{E}(X_+^2).$$

From Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 2.2 it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_-^2) \leq CW^2(\log(NW))^2 \leq \frac{\beta_0}{4}NW,$$

provided that $N \geq C'(D_0, D_1, |E|, \beta_0, \varepsilon) W^{1+\varepsilon}$. From the assumption that

$$\mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|) \leq (NW)^{1/2}$$

and the large deviations estimate it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_+) \leq \mathbb{P}\Big(|\log|f_N^E| - \mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|)| > (NW)^{1/2+\varepsilon}\Big) \leq \exp(-(NW)^{\varepsilon/2}/2)$$

for $N \geq C(D_0, D_1, |E|, \varepsilon)$. It now follows from Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_+^2) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_+)}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}((\log|f_N^E|)^4)} \leq C\exp(-(NW)^{\varepsilon/2}/4)(NW)^2\log^2(NW) \\ \leq \frac{\beta_0}{4}NW,\end{aligned}$$

provided $N \geq C'(D_0, D_1, |E|, \beta_0, \varepsilon)$. We now have that

$$\mathbb{E}(X^2) \geq \frac{\beta_0}{4}NW,$$

for $N \geq C(D_0, D_1, |E|, \beta_0, \varepsilon) W^{1+\varepsilon}$.

Another application of Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 2.2 yields

$$\mathbb{E}(X_-) \geq -CW\log(NW) \geq -\frac{\beta_0}{8}(NW)^{1/2-\varepsilon}$$

provided $N \geq C'(D_0, D_1, |E|, \beta_0, \varepsilon) W^{1+5\varepsilon}$. We used the fact that

$$(W^{1+5\varepsilon}W)^{1/2-\varepsilon} \geq W^{1+\varepsilon/4}, \tag{5.2}$$

for $\varepsilon \ll 1$.

We can now conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\log|f_N^E|) \geq \mathbb{E}(X) + \mathbb{E}(X_-) \geq \frac{1}{2}(NW)^{-1/2-\varepsilon}\frac{\beta_0}{4}NW - \frac{\beta_0}{8}(NW)^{1/2-\varepsilon} \\ = \frac{\beta_0}{8}(NW)^{1/2-\varepsilon},\end{aligned}$$

provided $N \geq C(D_0, D_1, |E|, \beta_0, \varepsilon) W^{1+5\varepsilon}$. □

We are finally able to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.1) From Proposition 5.2 and Lemma 5.3, with $N = CW^{1+5\delta}$, $\delta \ll 1$, and $C = C(D_0, D_1, |E|, \beta_0, \delta)$ large enough, we obtain

$$\gamma_1^E + \ldots + \gamma_W^E \geq \frac{\beta_0}{8}\frac{(NW)^{1/2-\delta}}{N} - C\frac{W\log(NW)}{N} \geq \frac{\beta_0}{16}\frac{(NW)^{1/2-\delta}}{N}$$
$$\simeq c\frac{(W^{1+5\delta}W)^{1/2-\delta}}{W^{1+5\delta}} \geq cW^{-5\delta}.$$

For the last inequality we used (5.2). The conclusion follows immediately. □

References

[AM93] Michael Aizenman and Stanislav Molchanov. Localization at large disorder and at extreme energies: an elementary derivation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 157(2):245–278, 1993.

[BGV13] I. Binder, M. Goldstein, and M. Voda. On fluctuations and localization length for the Anderson model on a strip. *arXiv:1310.0514 [math-ph]*, October 2013.

[BL85] Philippe Bougerol and Jean Lacroix. *Products of random matrices with applications to Schrödinger operators*, volume 8 of *Progress in Probability and Statistics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1985.

[Bou13] J. Bourgain. A lower bound for the Lyapounov exponents of the random Schrödinger operator on a strip. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 153(1):1–9, 2013.

[CGK09] Jean-Michel Combes, François Germinet, and Abel Klein. Generalized eigenvalue-counting estimates for the Anderson model. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 135(2):201–216, 2009.

[CL90] René Carmona and Jean Lacroix. *Spectral theory of random Schrödinger operators*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1990.

[CS83] Walter Craig and Barry Simon. Log Hölder continuity of the integrated density of states for stochastic Jacobi matrices. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 90(2):207–218, 1983.

[GM87] I. Ya. Gol′dsheĭd and G. A. Margulis. The condition of simplicity for the spectrum of Lyapunov exponents. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 293(2):297–301, 1987.

[HJ85] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.

[KLS90] Abel Klein, Jean Lacroix, and Athanasios Speis. Localization for the Anderson model on a strip with singular potentials. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 94(1):135–155, 1990.

[KS88] S. Kotani and B. Simon. Stochastic Schrödinger operators and Jacobi matrices on the strip. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 119(3):403–429, 1988.

[Pet95] Valentin V. Petrov. *Limit theorems of probability theory*, volume 4 of *Oxford Studies in Probability*. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1995. Sequences of independent random variables, Oxford Science Publications.

[Sch09] Jeffrey Schenker. Eigenvector localization for random band matrices with power law band width. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 290(3):1065–1097, 2009.

[Tor52] Leonard Tornheim. The Sylvester-Franke theorem. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 59:389–391, 1952.

[Zha05] Fuzhen Zhang, editor. *The Schur complement and its applications*, volume 4 of *Numerical Methods and Algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.

I. Binder: Dept. of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, M5S 2E4, Canada; `ilia@math.utoronto.ca`

M. Goldstein: Dept. of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, M5S 2E4, Canada; gold@math.utoronto.ca

M. Voda: Dept. of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, M5S 2E4, Canada; mvoda@math.utoronto.ca